

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16 - 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 16 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner, and Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

The Examiner also rejected claims 16 - 22 and 30 - 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicants admitted prior art and over *Reinheimer et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,184,725) or *Wewers* (U.S. Patent No. 5,244,025) and *Williams* (U.S. Patent No. 3,129,811). The Examiner also rejected claims 16 - 22 and 30 - 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Focke et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,018,625) or *Regenstein et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,460,088) in view of *Reinheimer et al.* or *Wewers* or *Williams*. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

According to the Examiner, the admitted prior art discloses generally all of the elements of the claims, but the Examiner admits that the admitted prior art fails to disclose a square package. The Examiner argues, however, that providing a square-shaped package is a conventional design in packaging art and, moreover, that *Reinheimer et al.* and *Wewers* each disclose a square-shaped package. The Examiner further admits that the admitted prior art fails to disclose the folding of papers, but argues that *Williams* teaches an absorbent paper wherein the paper is folded. The

Examiner further argues that *Focke et al.* discloses a package comprises packs for stacks of folded paper tissues and that *Rugenstein* discloses a soft pack consisting of a plastic film, but admits that the references fail to disclose a square package. The

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com

Examiner argues, however, that providing a square-shaped package is a conventional design in packaging art and, moreover, that *Reinheimer et al.* and *Wewers* each disclose a square-shaped package.

Contrary to Examiner's assertion, however, *Reinheimer et al.* and *Wewers* do not disclose folded absorbent paper tissue products that are folded into a square shape, as required by the claims. First, *Wewers* discloses square cotton flannel panels that are stitched together to make a pouch for holding china. Not only does the prior art not disclose folded absorbent paper tissue products, but this reference is not even relevant to the packaging of absorbent paper tissues. Second, *Reinheimer et al.* does not disclose a square-shaped product. Instead, as shown in the drawing, the product is rectangular-shaped. Moreover, there is nothing in the specification that suggests that the product be square-shaped. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in the admitted prior art that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to modify that which is disclosed into square-shaped paper tissue products. The remaining references, as admitted by the Examiner, do not disclose folded absorbent paper tissue products that are square-shaped. Thus, for at least these reasons, claims 16, 30, and 31, as well as the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

The Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the pending claims in condition for allowance. The Applicants submit that the proposed amendments to the claims do not raise new issues or

necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com

the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, the Applicants submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 18, 2003

By:



Barry D. Biddle  
Reg. No. 44,033

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com